

[4th March 1925]

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"The hon. the Law Member may utilize the C.I.D. to find out the information."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"The hon. Member would be the first to blame me."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"The Chief Engineer may very well be asked and he will be able to give the information."

Mr. P. N. MARTHANDAM PILLAI:—"May I ask the hon. Member from Coimbatore the basis for his information?"

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"The hon. the Law Member has asked me to give the information confidentially and probably I may write to him confidentially."

### Executive Council.

#### *Appointment to the Executive Council.*

\* 308 Q.—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state the reasons why a European Member of the Indian Civil Service has been appointed to the Executive Council in violation of the principle laid down by the Joint Parliamentary Committee on the Government of India Bill of 1919?

A.—The hon. Member is referred to the answer to question No. 183.

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"The usual answer by reference is given. So far as I recollect now, the answer was that such a principle does not apply to temporary appointments. I am not asking whether there are statutory obligations imposed but whether the Joint Parliamentary Committee have not enunciated certain principles, one of them being that two members should be Indians and two Europeans. I am asking the hon. the Finance Member whether the Government think that they can go behind this principle and not appoint two Indians. I really want to know what the position of the Government is in the matter."

The hon. Mr. R. A. GRAHAM:—"The question was why, contrary to the recommendations of the Joint Committee, the Government have appointed a third Member from among the Services while there are already two such Members. That was the former question. The answer was that the appointment in question is a temporary arrangement and the recommendation could not apply. It is obviously undesirable to make a temporary appointment which may be upset by the Secretary of State and may cause considerable heart-burning to the person concerned."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"May I ask how long this temporary appointment is likely to continue?"

The hon. Mr. R. A. GRAHAM:—"I am unable to answer."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Is it likely to continue till Sir Arthur Knapp retires and is it proposed to appoint an Indian afterwards so that he will be the junior Member of the Government?"

The hon. Sir ARTHUR KNAPP:—"I have two more years to run."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"I thought he was going to retire."



4th March 1925]

**Provincial Civil Service.**

*Appointment of Diwan Bahadur R. Ramachandra Rao, C.S.I.,  
as Collector of Madras.*

\* 309 Q.—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that Diwan Bahadur R. Ramachandra Rao, c.s.i., a member of the Madras Civil Service, was appointed permanently to the office of Secretary to the Government of Madras in 1917 with the approval of the Secretary of State in Council under section 100 of the Government of India Act on the special representation of the Government of Madras;

(b) whether he continued as Secretary to the Government of Madras till December 1924;

(c) whether he has since that date been posted as Collector of Madras, a post lower in rank and status to that of Secretary to Government;

(d) whether the said posting had the approval of the Government of India and the Secretary of State; and

(e) if not, under what authority the Local Government acted?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) & (c) Mr. Ramachandra Rao was Secretary to Government, Law Department, till 12th April 1924, when he was placed on special duty in the Revenue Department. He continued on special duty (with the exception of the period from 29th May to 28th September 1924 when he was on leave) till 3rd December 1924. He was posted as Collector of Madras and took charge of the office on 4th December 1924. The post of Collector is not lower in rank and status than that of a junior Secretary.

(d) The approval of the Government of India and the Secretary of State was not obtained.

(e) The posting was a matter within the powers of the Local Government.

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"I want to know from the Finance Member with reference to section 100 of the Government of India Act, whether as a matter of fact, Diwan Bahadur R. Ramachandra Rao's appointment was approved by the Secretary of State as required by that section."

The hon. Mr. R. A. GRAHAM:—"The answer is as in clause (a) of the answer."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Then, with reference to clauses (b) and (c) of this question, may I ask the reasons why Diwan Bahadur Ramachandra Rao was posted as Collector when he was acting as Secretary to Government?"

The hon. Mr. R. A. GRAHAM:—"The posting of officers is a matter for the Government's discretion."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Is there any case of any Secretary to Government having been posted before now, as Collector?"

The hon. Mr. R. A. GRAHAM:—"There are cases."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Of men appointed under section 100 of the Government of India Act?"

The hon. Mr. R. A. GRAHAM:—"I cannot say that."